Connected order ideals and P-partitions

Ben P. Zhou

Center for Combinatorics
Nankai University
Tianjin 300071, P.R. China

benpzhou@163.com

arXiv:1609.05471v1 [math.CO] 18 Sep 2016

Abstract

For a poset P on $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, let $F_P(\mathbf{x})$ be the fundamental generating function associated with P-partitions. Using the properties of graphic zonotopes and graph-associahedra, Féray and Reiner showed that $F_P(\mathbf{x})$ can be written as a summation of rational functions over the set of P-forests. A P-forest is a forest on $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ such that for any vertex i, the subtree rooted at i is a connected order ideal of P, and that whenever two vertices i and j are incomparable in the forest, the union of the subtrees rooted at i and j is a disconnected order ideal of P. For a special class of posets, namely, naturally labeled forests with duplications, they also obtained a closed formula for $F_P(\mathbf{x})$. In this paper, we establish a bijection between the set of P-forests and the set of maximum independent sets of a graph G_P. Here, G_P is a graph, whose vertices are the connected order ideals of P, such that there is an edge connecting two distinct connected order ideals J_1 and J_2 if $J_1 \cap J_2 \neq \emptyset$, $J_1 \not\subseteq J_2$ and $J_2 \not\subseteq J_1$. Using this bijection and the formula of Féray and Reiner, in the case when P is a naturally labeled poset, we obtain an expression of $F_P(\mathbf{x})$ as a product of rational functions. When P is restricted to a naturally labeled forest with duplications, this reduces to the formula of Féray and Reiner. We also consider some specializations of our formula for $F_P(\mathbf{x})$. In particular, we are led to a new approach to counting linear extensions of finite posets.

Keywords: P-partition, linear extension, connected order ideal

2010 AMS Subject Classifications: 05A15, 06A07

1 Introduction

Let P be a poset on $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. We use $\leq_P$ to denote the order relation on P to distinguish from the natural order $\leq$ on integers. A P-partition is a map f from P to the set $\mathbb{N}$ of nonnegative integers such that

(1) if $i <_P j$, then $f(i) \geq f(j)$;

(2) if $i <_P j$ and $i > j$, then $f(i) > f(j)$,

see Stanley [8] or Gessel [5]. Let $\mathscr{A}(P)$ denote the set of P-partitions. The fundamental generating function $F_P(\mathbf{x})$ associated with P-partitions is defined as

$$F_P(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{f \in \mathscr{A}(P)} \mathbf{x}^f = \sum_{f \in \mathscr{A}(P)} x_1^{f(1)} x_2^{f(2)} \cdots x_n^{f(n)}.$$

Stanley [8] showed that $F_P(\mathbf{x})$ can be expressed as a summation of rational functions over linear extensions of P. Recall that a linear extension of P is a permutation $w = w_1 w_2 \cdots w_n$ on $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ such that $i < j$ whenever $w_i <_P w_j$. Let $\mathcal{L}(P)$ be the set of linear extensions of P. For a permutation w, write

$$\mathrm{Des}(w) = \{i \,|\, 1 \leq i \leq n-1, w_i > w_{i+1}\}$$

for the descent set of w. Stanley [8] found that

$$F_P(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{w \in \mathcal{L}(P)} \frac{\prod_{i \in \mathrm{Des}(w)} x_{w_1} x_{w_2} \cdots x_{w_i}}{\prod_{j=1}^{n} \left(1 - x_{w_1} x_{w_2} \cdots x_{w_j}\right)}. \tag{1}$$

When the poset P is a forest, Boussicault, Féray, Lascoux, and Reiner [2] obtained a close formula for $F_P(\mathbf{x})$. When viewed as a poset, a forest P is endowed with the following order relation. We say that $i <_P j$ if i is a descendant of j. The descent set of a forest P is introduced by Björner and Wachs [1], which is defined as

$$\mathrm{Des}(P) = \{i \,|\, \text{ if } j \text{ is the parent of } i, \text{ then } i > j\}.$$

Boussicault, Féray, Lascoux, and Reiner [2] showed that for a forest P,

$$F_P(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\prod_{i \in \mathrm{Des}(P)} \prod_{k \leq_P i} x_k}{\prod_{j=1}^{n} \left(1 - \prod_{\ell \leq_P j} x_\ell\right)}. \tag{2}$$

On the other hand, for any poset P, Féray and Reiner [4] derived a formula for $F_P(\mathbf{x})$ which is a summation of rational functions over P-forests. Recall that an order ideal of P is a subset J such that if $i \in J$ and $j \leq_P i$, then $j \in J$. An order ideal J is connected if the Hasse diagram of J is a connected graph. A P-forest F is a forest on $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ such that for any vertex i, the subtree rooted at i is a connected order ideal of P, and that for any two incomparable vertices i and j of F, the union of the trees rooted at i and j is a disconnected order ideal of P. Let $\mathscr{F}(P)$ stand for the set of P-forests. For example, in Figure 1 we illustrate a poset P for which there are three P-forests F_1, F_2 and F_3.



Figure 1: A poset P and the corresponding P-forests.

Féray and Reiner [4] showed that the set of linear extensions of P can be expressed as a (disjoint) union of the sets of linear extensions of P-forests, namely,

$$\mathcal{L}(P) = \bigcup_{F \in \mathscr{F}(P)} \mathcal{L}(F). \tag{3}$$

As remarked by Féray and Reiner [4], the decomposition in (3) has also appeared in the work of Postnikov [6] and Posnikov, Reiner and Williams [7]. Combining (1), (2) and (3), it follows that

$$F_P(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{F \in \mathscr{F}(P)} \frac{\prod_{i \in \mathrm{Des}(F)} \prod_{k \leq_F i} x_k}{\prod_{j=1}^{n} \left(1 - \prod_{\ell \leq_F j} x_\ell\right)}. \tag{4}$$

Féray and Reiner [4] also obtained a closed formula for $F_P(\mathbf{x})$ for a special class of posets, namely, naturally labeled forests with duplications. Say that two distinct connected order ideals J_1 and J_2 intersect trivially if they satisfy any one of the following conditions:

$$J_1 \cap J_2 = \emptyset, \quad \text{or } J_1 \subset J_2, \quad \text{or} \quad J_2 \subset J_1.$$

Otherwise, say that J_1 and J_2 intersect nontrivially. In other words, two distinct connected order ideals J_1 and J_2 intersect nontrivially if

$$J_1 \cap J_2 \neq \emptyset, \quad J_1 \not\subset J_2, \quad \text{and} \quad J_2 \not\subset J_1.$$

A poset P is called a forest with duplications if for any connected order ideal J of P, there exists at most one other connected order ideal J' such that J and J' intersect nontrivially. Recall that a poset P is naturally labeled if $i < j$ whenever $i <_P j$. For a naturally labeled forest with duplications, Féray and Reiner [4] proved that

$$F_P(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\prod_{\{J_1, J_2\} \in \Delta(P)} \left(1 - \prod_{i \in J_1} x_i \prod_{j \in J_2} x_j\right)}{\prod_{J \in \mathcal{J}_{conn}(P)} \left(1 - \prod_{k \in J} x_k\right)}, \tag{5}$$

where $\mathcal{J}_{conn}(P)$ is the set of connected order ideals of P, $\Delta(P)$ is the set consisting of pairs $\{J_1, J_2\}$ of distinct connected order ideals that intersect nontrivially. Note that when P is a naturally labeled forest, formula (5) coincides with formula (2).

Motivated by the above work of Féray and Reiner, we define a graph G_P, whose vertex set is $\mathcal{J}_{conn}(P)$, such that two connected order ideals are adjacent if they intersect nontrivially. We establish a bijection Φ between the set $\mathscr{F}(P)$ of P-forests and the set $\mathscr{M}(G_P)$ of maximum independent sets in the graph G_P. Recall that an independent set of a graph G is a subset of vertices of G such that no two vertices in the subset are adjacent. A maximum independent set of a graph G is an independent set M of largest possible size, that is, $|M| \geq |M'|$ for any independent set M' of G. Using the bijection Φ and formula (4) of Féray and Reiner, in the case when P is a naturally labeled poset, we obtain a product formula for $F_P(\mathbf{x})$. When restricted to naturally labeled forest with duplications, this formula reduces to the expression in (5) due to Féray and Reiner. When replacing each x_i by q in our formula, we are

led to a formula for the generating function of the major index for linear extensions of a naturally labeled poset P. In particular, letting $q \to 1$, we get a new approach to counting the linear extensions of P.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we aim to establish the aforementioned bijection Φ between the set of P-forests and the set of maximal independent sets of the graph G_P. In Section 3, we give some properties on the maximum independent sets of G_P. Combining with the bijection Φ and formula (4) due to Féray and Reiner, we deduce a product formula for $F_P(\mathbf{x})$ where P is a naturally labeled poset. In Section 4, we consider some specializations of our formula for $F_P(\mathbf{x})$. One of the specialization gives a new way to count linear extensions of P.

2 A bijection Φ between $\mathscr{F}(P)$ and $\mathscr{M}(G_P)$

In this section, we shall establish a bijection Φ between the set $\mathscr{F}(P)$ of P-forests and the set $\mathscr{M}(G_P)$ of maximum independent sets of the graph G_P. Let $F \in \mathscr{F}(P)$ be a P-forest. For $1 \leq i \leq n$, let $\Lambda_i = \{j \mid j \leq_F i\}$ be the subtree rooted at i. Since F is a P-forest, Λ_i is a connected order ideal of P, and thus Λ_i is a vertex of the graph G_P. Recall that $\mathcal{J}_{conn}(P)$ is the set of connected order ideals of P. For a forest F, notice that

$$\mathcal{J}_{conn}(F) = \{\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \ldots, \Lambda_n\}.$$

This implies that $\mathcal{J}_{conn}(F) \subseteq \mathcal{J}_{conn}(P)$. As will be shown in Lemma 2.2, $\mathcal{J}_{conn}(F)$ is a maximum independent set of G_P, namely, $\mathcal{J}_{conn}(F) \in \mathscr{M}(G_P)$ for any P-forest F. The main theorem of this section states that the map

$$\Phi : F \longrightarrow \mathcal{J}_{conn}(F)$$

from $\mathscr{F}(P)$ to $\mathscr{M}(G_P)$ is a bijection.

Theorem 2.1. *The map Φ is a bijection from $\mathscr{F}(P)$ to $\mathscr{M}(G_P)$.*

Before we present a proof of Theorem 2.1, we illustrate the bijection Φ by an example. Consider the poset P given in Figure 1. The connected order ideals of P as well as the graph G_P are given in Figure 2, where we use boldface to indicate the maximal elements in each connected order ideal. It is easy to see that there are three maximum independent sets in G_P:

$$\begin{aligned} M^1 &= \{\Lambda_3, \Lambda_4, \Lambda_6, \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \Lambda_{2,5}\}, \\ M^2 &= \{\Lambda_3, \Lambda_4, \Lambda_6, \Lambda_1, \Lambda_{1,5}, \Lambda_{2,5}\}, \\ M^3 &= \{\Lambda_3, \Lambda_4, \Lambda_6, \Lambda_5, \Lambda_{1,5}, \Lambda_{2,5}\}. \end{aligned}$$

There are there P-forests F_1, F_2 and F_3 as shown in Figure 1. By the construction of Φ, it is easily verified that $\Phi(F_i) = M^i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$.

To prove Theorem 2.1, we need several lemmas. The first lemma asserts that for a P-forest F, $\mathcal{J}_{conn}(F)$ is a maximum independent set of G_P.



Figure 2: Connected order ideals of a poset P and the graph G_P.

Lemma 2.2. *Let P be a poset on $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, and $F \in \mathscr{F}(P)$ be a P-forest. Then $\mathcal{J}_{conn}(F)$ is a maximum independent set of G_P.*

Proof. We first show that $\mathcal{J}_{conn}(F)$ is an independent set, that is, for two distinct vertices i and j of F, there is no edge connecting the order ideals Λ_i and Λ_j. We consider two cases.

Case 1: The vertices i and j are incomparable in F. Clearly, $\Lambda_i \cap \Lambda_j = \emptyset$. This implies that Λ_i and Λ_j intersect trivially, and thus there is no edge connecting Λ_i and Λ_j.

Case 2: The vertices i and j are comparable in F. If $i <_F j$, then $\Lambda_i \subset \Lambda_j$, and if $j <_F i$, then $\Lambda_j \subset \Lambda_i$. In both cases, Λ_i and Λ_j intersect trivially, and so there is no edge connecting Λ_i and Λ_j.

We proceed to show that the independent set $\mathcal{J}_{conn}(F)$ is of the largest possible size. To this end, since $|\mathcal{J}_{conn}(F)| = n$, we verify that for any independent set M of G_P, $|M| \leq n$. Assume that $M = \{J_1, J_2, \ldots, J_k\}$, where J_i $(1 \leq i \leq k)$ are connected order ideals of G_P. We further assume that $r < s$ whenever $J_r \subset J_s$. In fact, this can be achieved by choosing $J_1 J_2 \cdots J_k$ to be a linear extension of the poset M when ordered by inclusion. For $1 \leq s \leq k$, set

$$I_s = \bigcup_{1 \leq r \leq s} J_r.$$

Then we see that $I_{s-1} \subseteq I_s$ for any $1 < s \leq k$. We claim that for any $1 < s \leq k$,

$$I_{s-1} \neq I_s. \tag{6}$$

Suppose to the contrary that $I_s = I_{s-1}$ for some $1 < s \leq k$. Then,

$$J_s \subseteq I_{s-1} = \bigcup_{1 \leq r \leq s-1} J_r. \tag{7}$$

Let U_s be the set defined by

$$U_s = \{J_r \,|\, 1 \leq r \leq s-1, J_r \subset J_s\}. \tag{8}$$

Clearly,

$$\bigcup_{J\in U_s} J \subseteq J_s. \tag{9}$$

Notice that for any $1 \leq r \leq s-1$, if J_r is not in U_s then $J_r \cap J_s = \emptyset$, since otherwise J_r and J_s intersect nontrivially and there would be an edge connecting J_r and J_s. In view of relation (7), we have

$$J_s \subseteq \bigcup_{J\in U_s} J,$$

which, together with (9), leads to

$$J_s = \bigcup_{J\in U_s} J.$$

On the other hand, let $J_{i_1}, \ldots, J_{i_\ell}$ be the maximal elements of U_s when ordered by inclusion. Since there is no edge of G_P connecting any two of these maximal elements, they are pairwise disjoint. When $\ell = 1$, we get $J_s = J_{i_1}$, which is contrary to $J_{i_1} \subset J_s$. When $\ell > 1$, we see that $J_s = J_{i_1} \cup \cdots \cup J_{i_\ell}$, contradicting the fact that J_s is a connected order ideal. This proves the claim in (6).

By the above claim, it follows that for each $1 < s \leq k$, I_{s-1} is properly contained in I_s. Hence we have

$$\emptyset \neq I_1 \subset I_2 \subset \cdots \subset I_k \subseteq \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}, \tag{10}$$

which implies that $|M| = k \leq n$. So the proof is complete. □

By Lemma 2.2, we see that Φ is a map from $\mathscr{F}(P)$ to $\mathscr{M}(G_P)$. Moreover, from the proof of Lemma 2.2 we see that each maximum independent set of G_P contains exactly n elements. To show that Φ is a bijection, we shall construct the inverse Ψ of Φ. To give a description of Ψ, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 2.3. *Let P be a poset on $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, and $M \in \mathscr{M}(G_P)$ be a maximum independent set of G_P. For any $J \in M$, let M_J be the union of connected order ideals J' in M that are properly contained in J. Then*

$$|J \setminus M_J| = 1. \tag{11}$$

Moreover, the unique element in $J \setminus M_J$ is a maximal element in the connected order ideal J.

Proof. Let $M = \{J_1, J_2, \ldots, J_n\}$ be a maximum independent set of G_P. As in the proof of Lemma 2.2, we assume that $r < s$ whenever $J_r \subset J_s$. We also set

$$I_s = \bigcup_{1\leq r\leq s} J_r, \qquad \text{where } 1 \leq s \leq n.$$

Clearly, $I_{s-1} \subseteq I_s$ for $1 < s \leq n$. Using the same argument that we prove the assertion in (6), we get $I_{s-1} \neq I_s$. So we have

$$\emptyset \neq I_1 \subset I_2 \subset \cdots \subset I_n \subseteq \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}. \tag{12}$$

Therefore, for $1 \leq s \leq n$,

$$|I_s \setminus I_{s-1}| = 1, \tag{13}$$

where we set $I_0 = \emptyset$.

Let $J \in M$ be a connected order ideal of G. Assume that $J = J_s$ for some $1 \leq s \leq n$. Then we have

$$J \setminus M_J = J_s \setminus M_{J_s} = J_s \setminus I_{s-1} = I_s \setminus I_{s-1}, \tag{14}$$

where the second equality follows from the fact that for any $1 \leq r \leq s-1$, either $J_r \subset J_s$ or $J_r \cap J_s = \emptyset$. On the other hand, by (13) it follows that there is exactly one element in J_s that is not contained in I_{s-1}. So, in view of (14), we arrive at (11).

It remains to show that the element in $J \setminus M_J$ is a maximal element in the connected order ideal J. Let a be the unique element in $J \setminus M_J$. Suppose that a is not a maximal element of J. Then there exists a maximal element b in J such that $a <_P b$. By (11) and the fact that $a \notin M_J$, we see that $b \in J'$ for some $J' \subset J$ of M. This leads to the contradiction that $a \in J'$. Hence a is a maximal element of J, and the proof is complete. □

By Lemma 2.3, we can define a map Ψ from the set $\mathscr{M}(G_P)$ of maximum independent sets of G_P to the set $\mathscr{F}(P)$ of P-forests as follows. Let $M \in \mathscr{M}(G_P)$ be a maximum independent set of G_P. We regard M as a poset ordered by inclusion. Consider the Hasse diagram of this poset. For each connected order ideal $J \in M$, by Lemma 2.3, we can associate J with the unique number in $J \setminus M_J$. By the proof of Lemma 2.3, it is clear that

$$\bigcup_{J \in M} J \setminus M_J = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}.$$

We define $\Psi(M)$ to be the graph on $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ obtained from the Hasse diagram by replacing each node $J \in M$ with the unique number in $J \setminus M_J$.

The following lemma shows that $\Psi(M)$ is a P-forest, which ensures that Ψ is a map from the set $\mathscr{M}(G_P)$ to the set $\mathscr{F}(P)$.

Lemma 2.4. *Let P be a poset on $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, and $M \in \mathscr{M}(G_P)$ be a maximum independent set of G_P. Then $\Psi(M)$ is a P-forest.*

Proof. We first show that $\Psi(M)$ is a forest. Suppose otherwise that $\Psi(M)$ is not a forest. Then in the poset M there exists a connected order ideal $J \in M$ such that J is covered by two distinct connected order ideals J_1, J_2 in M. Since J_1 and J_2 are incomparable, it follows that $J_1 \not\subset J_2$ and $J_2 \not\subset J_1$. Moreover, notice that $J \subseteq J_1 \cap J_2$. This implies that J_1 and J_2 intersect nontrivially, and thus $\{J_1, J_2\}$ is an edge of the graph G_P, contradicting the fact that M is an independent set.

We proceed to show that $\Psi(M)$ is a P-forest. To do this, we first claim that for each vertex i $(1 \leq i \leq n)$, the subtree Λ_i of $\Psi(M)$ rooted at i is a connected order ideal of P. Let $J \in M$ be the unique connected order ideal in M such that

$J \setminus M_J = \{i\}$. By the construction of $\Psi(M)$, it is easily seem that $\Lambda_i = J$. This verifies the claim.

We still need to check that for $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$, if i and j are incomparable in $\Psi(M)$, then the union of Λ_i and Λ_j is a disconnected order ideal of P. Assume that J and J' are the connected order ideals in M such that $M \setminus M_J = \{i\}$ and $M \setminus M_{J'} = \{j\}$. Then $\Lambda_i \cap \Lambda_j = J \cap J'$. Suppose to the contrary that $\Lambda_i \cap \Lambda_j \neq \emptyset$. Since i and j are incomparable in $\Psi(M)$, we obtain that $J \not\subset J'$ and $J' \not\subset J$. On the other hand, notice that J and J' intersect trivially. This allows us to conclude that $J \cap J' = \emptyset$. Now we see that $\Lambda_i \cap \Lambda_j = \emptyset$, which implies that the union of Λ_i and Λ_j is a disconnected order ideal of P. This completes the proof. □

By the constructions of Φ and Ψ, it is easy to check that $\Psi \cdot \Phi(F) = F$ for any P-forest F, and $\Phi \cdot \Psi(M) = M$ for any maximum independent set M of G_P. It follows that Ψ is the inverse of Φ, and hence Φ is a bijection. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.1.

3 $F_P(\mathbf{x})$ for naturally labeled posets

In this section, we shall provide a partition $\{M_1, M_2, \ldots, M_h\}$ for each maximum independent set M of G_P, where h is a positive integer depending only on P. We define the descent set for each block M_r $(1 \leq r \leq h)$. We then show that the descent set of the P-forest $F = \Psi(M)$ corresponding to M is the disjoint union of the descent sets of M_r. Combined with the formula in (4) of Féray and Reiner, we obtain a product formula for the fundamental generating function $F_P(\mathbf{x})$, where P is a poset with a natural labeling. When P is restricted to a naturally labeled forest with duplications, our formula specializes to the expression in (5) due to Féray and Reiner.

To describe the partition for a maximum independent set M of G_P, we first introduce a partition of the set $\mathcal{J}_{conn}(P)$ of connected order ideals of P. For an order ideal J of P, we use $\mathrm{gs}(J)$ to represent the set of maximal elements of J. For $1 \leq i \leq n$, let $\Lambda_i = \{k \,|\, k \leq_P i\}$ be the principal order ideal of P generated by i. Clearly,

$$J = \bigcup_{i \in \mathrm{gs}(J)} \Lambda_i.$$

Let H_P be the subgraph of G_P that are induced by the principal order ideals $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \ldots, \Lambda_n$ of the poset P. We have the following assertion.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $J \in \mathcal{J}_{conn}(P)$ be a connected order ideal of P, and assume that $\mathrm{gs}(J) = \{i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_k\}$. Then, the subgraph of H_P induced by the principal order ideals $\Lambda_{i_1}, \Lambda_{i_2}, \ldots, \Lambda_{i_k}$ is connected.*

Proof. Define

$$\mathrm{Conn}(i_1) = \big\{ i_r \in \mathrm{gs}(J) \,|\, \text{there is a path in } H_P \text{ connecting } \Lambda_{i_1} \text{ and } \Lambda_{i_r} \big\}.$$

Note that i_1 is always contained in $\mathrm{Conn}(i_1)$. We aim to show that $\mathrm{Conn}(i_1) = \mathrm{gs}(J)$. Suppose otherwise that $\mathrm{Conn}(i_1) \neq \mathrm{gs}(J)$. Set

$$I_1 = \bigcup_{j \in \mathrm{Conn}(i_1)} \Lambda_j \quad \text{and} \quad I_2 = \bigcup_{j \in \mathrm{gs}(J) \setminus \mathrm{Conn}(i_1)} \Lambda_j.$$

It is clear that I_1 and I_2 are both nonempty subsets of J satisfying that $I_1 \cup I_2 = J$. Since J is a connected order ideal of P, it follows that $I_1 \cap I_2 \neq \emptyset$. Thus there exists some $u \in \mathrm{Conn}(i_1)$ and some $v \in \mathrm{gs}(J) \setminus \mathrm{Conn}(i_1)$ such that $\Lambda_u \cap \Lambda_v \neq \emptyset$. This means that Λ_u and Λ_v intersect nontrivially. Hence Λ_u and Λ_v are adjacent, implying that $v \in \mathrm{Conn}(i_1)$. This leads to a contradiction, and so the proof is complete. □

Assume that the graph H_P has h connected components, which are denoted $C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_h$. By Lemma 3.1, we see that for any connected order ideal J of P, the principal order ideals of P generated by the maximal elements of J are vertices in the same connected component of H_P. For $1 \leq r \leq h$, let $\mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P)$ be the set consisting of connected order ideals J such that for each maximal element $i \in \mathrm{gs}(J)$ of J, Λ_i is a vertex of the connected component C_r. Obviously, $J_{conn}(P)$ is a disjoint union of the subsets

$$\mathcal{J}^1_{conn}(P), \mathcal{J}^2_{conn}(P), \ldots, \mathcal{J}^h_{conn}(P).$$

We use an example to illustrate the partition for $J_{conn}(P)$. In Figure 3, we give a poset P together with the graph H_P, where Λ_i represents the principal order ideal generated by i. As can be seen, there are nine connected components for H_P. By the construction for $J^r_{conn}(P)$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{J}^1_{conn}(P) &= \{\Lambda_4, \Lambda_5, \Lambda_6, \Lambda_{4,5}, \Lambda_{5,6}, \Lambda_{4,6}, \Lambda_{4,5,6}\},\\
\mathcal{J}^2_{conn}(P) &= \{\Lambda_{10}, \Lambda_{13}, \Lambda_{14}, \Lambda_{15}, \Lambda_{10,13}, \Lambda_{13,15}, \Lambda_{14,15}\},\\
\mathcal{J}^3_{conn}(P) &= \{\Lambda_9, \Lambda_{11}, \Lambda_{12}, \Lambda_{9,11}, \Lambda_{12,11}\},\\
\mathcal{J}^4_{conn}(P) &= \{\Lambda_{16}, \Lambda_{17}, \Lambda_{16,17}\},\\
\mathcal{J}^5_{conn}(P) &= \{\Lambda_1\},\\
\mathcal{J}^6_{conn}(P) &= \{\Lambda_2\},\\
\mathcal{J}^7_{conn}(P) &= \{\Lambda_3\},\\
\mathcal{J}^8_{conn}(P) &= \{\Lambda_7\},\\
\mathcal{J}^9_{conn}(P) &= \{\Lambda_8\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The following lemma establishes a relation between a maximum independent set of G_P and maximum independent sets contained in each $\mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P)$. By a maximum independent set contained in $\mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P)$, we mean an independent set of G_P that is contained in $\mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P)$ and of largest possible size.

Lemma 3.2. *A set M is a maximum independent set of G_P if and only if there exists a sequence $(M_1, M_2, \ldots, M_h)$ of independent sets, where M_r $(1 \leq r \leq h)$ is a maximum independent set contained in $\mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P)$, such that*

$$M = M_1 \cup M_2 \cup \cdots \cup M_h. \tag{15}$$



Figure 3: A poset P and the graph H_P.

To prove Lemma 3.2, we need two properties on the graph G_P, as stated in Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.4

Lemma 3.3. *Let J be a connected order ideal of P, and let C be a connected subgraph of G_P. Assume that J is not adjacent to any vertex of C. If there exists a vertex J' of C such that $J' \subset J$, then $J'' \subset J$ for any vertex J'' of C.*

Proof. We first consider the case when J' is adjacent to J''. In this case, J' and J'' intersect nontrivially, and so we have $\emptyset \neq (J' \cap J'')$. On the other hand, since $J' \subset J$, we obtain that

$$\emptyset \neq (J' \cap J'') \subset (J \cap J''). \tag{16}$$

Combining (16) and the fact that J'' and J intersect trivially, we get $J'' \subset J$ or $J \subset J''$. If $J \subset J''$, then $J' \subset J \subset J''$, which is impossible because J' and J'' intersect nontrivially. Hence we have $J'' \subset J$.

We now consider the case when J' is not adjacent to J''. Since C is connected, there exists a sequence $(J' = J_0, J_1, \ldots, J_k = J'')$ $(k \geq 2)$ of vertices of C such that J_i is adjacent to J_{i-1} for $1 \leq i \leq k$. By the above argument, J_1 is contained in

J. Therefore, we can use induction on k to show that $J'' \subset J$. This completes the proof. □

Lemma 3.4. *For $r \neq s$, any two connected order ideals $J_1 \in \mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P)$ and $J_2 \in \mathcal{J}^s_{conn}(P)$ are not adjacent in the graph G_P.*

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that J_1 and J_2 are adjacent. Then $J_1 \cap J_2 \neq \emptyset$ and there must exist some $i \in \mathrm{gs}(J_1)$ and $j \in \mathrm{gs}(J_2)$ such that $\Lambda_i \cap \Lambda_j \neq \emptyset$. Note that Λ_i is a vertex in C_r and Λ_j is a vertex in C_s. Hence Λ_i and Λ_j intersect trivially. Since $\Lambda_i \cap \Lambda_j \neq \emptyset$, we must have $\Lambda_i \subset \Lambda_j$ or $\Lambda_j \subset \Lambda_i$. If $\Lambda_i \subset \Lambda_j$, by Lemma 3.3 we obtain that for any principal order ideal Λ_k in C_r, there holds $\Lambda_k \subset \Lambda_j$. So,

$$J_1 = \bigcup_{k \in \mathrm{gs}(J_1)} \Lambda_k \subset \Lambda_j \subseteq J_2,$$

which implies that J_1 and J_2 are not adjacent. If $\Lambda_j \subset \Lambda_i$, we can use a similar argument to deduce that J_1 and J_2 are not adjacent. In both cases, we are led to a contradiction. This concludes the proof. □

Based on Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.4, we can give a proof of Lemma 3.2.

Proof of Lemma 3.2. Assume that M is a maximum independent set of G_P. For $1 \leq r \leq h$, let $M_r = M \cap \mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P)$. Clearly, $M = M_1 \cup M_2 \cup \cdots \cup M_h$. It is easily seen that each M_r must be a maximum independent set contained in $\mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P)$. To show the reverse direction, let M'_r be a maximum independent set contained in $\mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P)$. Note that $|M'_r| = |M_r|$ for any $1 \leq r \leq h$ and any maximum independent set M. It follows from lemma 3.4 that $M' = M'_1 \cup M'_2 \cup \cdots \cup M'_h$ is an independent set of G_P. This completes the proof. □

By Lemma 3.2, each maximum independent set M of G_P can be partitioned into maximum independent sets M_r contained in $\mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P)$, and, conversely, the union of maximum independent sets M_r contained in $\mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P)$ is a maximum independent set M of G_P. Suppose that $F = \Psi(M)$ is the P-forest corresponding to M. We shall define the descent for each maximum independent set M_r contained in $\mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P)$, and show that the descent set of F is the union of the descent set of M_r. This will allow us to present a formula for $F_P(\mathbf{x})$.

Let M_r be a maximum independent set contained in $\mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P)$. To define the descent set of M_r, let M be any maximum independent set of G_P such that $M \cap \mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P) = M_r$. Let $F = \Psi(M)$ be the corresponding P-forest. Recall that F is obtained from the Hasse diagram of the poset M (ordered by inclusion) by replacing each connected order ideal $J \in M$ by $J \setminus M_J$, where M_J is the union of connected order ideals of M contained in J. Let F_r denote the induced subposet of F determined by M_r. In other words, we view M_r as a poset ordered by inclusion, and F_r is obtained from the poset M_r by replacing each vertex $J \in M_r$ by the unique number in $J \setminus M_J$. Clearly, the Hasse diagram of F_r is also a forest. We now define the descent set $\mathrm{Des}(M_r)$ to be

$$\mathrm{Des}(M_r) = \{i \in F_r \,|\, \text{if } j \text{ is the parent of } i \text{ and } j \in F_r, \text{ then } i > j\}.$$

By definition, it is not evident that M_r is well-defined. The following lemma clarifies this confusion.

Lemma 3.5. *Let M_r be an independent set contained in $\mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P)$ of largest possible size. Assume that M, $\widetilde{M}$ are any two maximum independent sets of G_P such that*

$$M \cap \mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P) = \widetilde{M} \cap \mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P) = M_r. \tag{17}$$

Then, for any $J \in M_r$,

$$J \setminus M_J = J \setminus \widetilde{M}_J. \tag{18}$$

Proof. Set

$$I(M, J) = \{J' \in M \mid J' \subset J\} \text{ and } I(\widetilde{M}, J) = \{J' \in \widetilde{M} \mid J' \subset J\},$$

and then

$$M_J = \bigcup_{J' \in I(M,J)} J' \text{ and } \widetilde{M}_J = \bigcup_{J' \in I(\widetilde{M},J)} J'$$

We partition the set $I(\widetilde{M}, J)$ into two subsets B_1 and B_2, where

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 &= \{J_1 \mid J_1 \in I(\widetilde{M}, J), J_1 \in \mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P)\}, \\ B_2 &= \{J_2 \mid J_2 \in I(\widetilde{M}, J), J_2 \notin \mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let a be the unique element in $J \setminus M_J$. We claim that for any $J_2 \in B_2$, $a \notin J_2$. Suppose otherwise that there exists some $J_2 \in B_2$ such that $a \in J_2$. By Lemma 2.3, a is a maximal element of J. So the principal order ideal Λ_a is a vertex of the connected component C_r of H_P. Since $J_2 \subset J$, we obtain that a is also a maximal element of J_2. This implies that $J_2 \in \mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P)$, leading to a contradiction. This proves the claim.

In view of (17),

$$I(M, J) \cap M_r = I(\widetilde{M}, J) \cap M_r = B_1,$$

and thus

$$a \in J \setminus M_J \subseteq J \setminus \bigcup_{J_1 \in B_1} J_1.$$

By the above claim, $a \notin J_2$ for any $J_2 \in B_2$ and so we have

$$a \in J \setminus \bigcup_{J' \in (B_1 \cup B_2)} J' = J \setminus \widetilde{M}_J.$$

Since $J \setminus \widetilde{M}_J$ contains exactly one element, we arrive at (18), as desired. □

Assume that M_r is a maximum independent set contained in $\mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P)$, and M is a maximum independent set of G_P such that $M \cap \mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P) = M_r$. By Lemma 3.5, we are allowed to use the following well-defined notation

$$\overline{\mathrm{Des}}(M_r) = \{J \in M_r \mid J \setminus M_J \subseteq \mathrm{Des}(M_r)\}, \tag{19}$$

which will appear in our formula for $F_P(\mathbf{x})$ as stated in Theorem 3.7.

Lemma 3.6. *Let P be a naturally labeled poset. Assume that M is a maximum independent set of G_P, and $F = \Psi(M)$ is the P-forest corresponding to M. Set $M_r = M \cap \mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P)$. Then* $\mathrm{Des}(F)$ *is a disjoint union of* $\mathrm{Des}(M_r)$*, namely,*

$$\mathrm{Des}(F) = \bigcup_{r=1}^{h} \mathrm{Des}(M_r). \tag{20}$$

Proof. We first verify that

$$\bigcup_{r=1}^{h} \mathrm{Des}(M_r) \subseteq \mathrm{Des}(F). \tag{21}$$

Let $i \in \mathrm{Des}(M_r)$ be a descent, and $J_1 \in M_r$ be such that $\{i\} = J_1 \setminus M_{J_1}$. Then there exists $J_2 \in M_r$ such that J_2 covers J_1 in the poset M_r ordered by inclusion. We claim that J_2 also covers J_1 in the poset M ordered by inclusion. If this is not the case, then there exists some $J \in M_s$ $(r \neq s)$ such that

$$J_1 \subset J \subset J_2. \tag{22}$$

Recall that H_P is the subgraph of G_P induced by the vertices of principal order ideals of P. We still use the notation C_r to represent the connected component of H_P based on which $\mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P)$ is defined. With this notation, both J_1 and J_2 are the unions of some principal order ideals in C_r. Since $J_1 \subset J$, there exists at least one principal order ideal in C_r contained in J. Combining Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.4, we see that every principal order ideal in C_r is contained in J. So we deduce that $J_2 \subset J$, which is contrary to (22). This proves the claim. Therefore, we obtain (21).

Let us proceed to show that the converse is also true, namely,

$$\mathrm{Des}(F) \subseteq \bigcup_{r=1}^{h} \mathrm{Des}(M_r). \tag{23}$$

Let $J_1 \in M_r$ and $J_2 \in M_s$, where $r \neq s$. Assume that $\{i\} = J_1 \setminus M_{J_1}$ and $\{j\} = J_2 \setminus M_{J_2}$. To prove (23), we need to verify that if J_1 is covered by J_2 in the poset M ordered by inclusion, then $i < j$. The argument is as follows. By Lemma 2.3, j is a maximal element of J_2. From the fact that J_2 covers J_1, it follows that $J_1 \subset J_2$. Since P is naturally labeled, we obtain that $i <_P j$, or i and j are incomparable in P. In fact, we claim that the latter case cannot happen.

Suppose otherwise that i and j are incomparable in P. Set

$$I = I(M, J_2) = \{J \in M \mid J \subset J_2\}.$$

Let $\mathrm{Max}(I)$ denote the set of maximal elements of I when ordered by inclusion. Since J_2 covers J_1, J_1 belongs to $\mathrm{Max}(I)$. Since the connected order ideals in $\mathrm{Max}(I)$ intersect trivially, they are pairwise disjoint. Note that

$$J_2 = \Lambda_j \cup \left(\bigcup_{J \in \mathrm{Max}(I)} J \right).$$

Because J_2 is a connected order ideal, it is clear that for any $J \in \mathrm{Max}(I)$, $\Lambda_j \cap J \neq \emptyset$. In particular, $\Lambda_j \cap J_1 \neq \emptyset$. Thus $\widetilde{J} = \Lambda_j \cup J_1$ is also a connected order ideal.

Again, by Lemma 2.3, i is a maximal element of J_1. Since i and j are incomparable, i is a maximal elements of $\widetilde{J}$. On the other hand, since j is a maximal element of J_2 and $\widetilde{J} \subseteq J_2$, j is also a maximal element of $\widetilde{J}$. By Lemma 3.1, Λ_i and Λ_j are vertices of the same connected component of the graph H_P. This contradicts the assumption that $J_1 \in M_r$ and $J_2 \in M_s$, and thus we finish the proof the claim.

By the above claim, we have $i <_P j$. Keep in mind that P is a naturally labeled poset. Hence we obtain that $i < j$. This completes the proof. □

We are now in a position to state the main theorem of this paper, which is a direct consequence of (4), Theorem 2.1, Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.6.

Theorem 3.7. *Let P be a naturally labeled poset. Then*

$$F_P(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{r=1}^{h} \sum_{M_r \subseteq \mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P)} \frac{\prod_{J \in \overline{\mathrm{Des}}(M_r)} \prod_{k \in J} x_k}{\prod_{J \in M_r} (1 - \prod_{j \in J} x_j)}, \tag{24}$$

where M_r runs over maximum independent sets contained in $\mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P)$, and the notation $\overline{\mathrm{Des}}(M_r)$ is as defined in (19).

We end this section with two remarks. The first one gives some additional information on the structure of the graph G_P.

Remark 1: For each $\mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P)$, there is a unique maximum element J^r_{max} ordered by inclusion:

$$J^r_{max} = \bigcup_{i \text{ is a vertex of } C_r} \Lambda_i.$$

It can be shown that J^r_{max} is an isolated vertex of G_P, and when $|\mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P)| \neq 1$, $\mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P) \setminus \{J^r_{max}\}$ is the vertex set of a connected components of G_P. For example, for the poset P in Figure 3, the graph G_P is given in Figure 4. The blocks $\mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P)$ $(1 \leq r \leq 9)$ have be listed before Lemma 3.2, from which one can easily check the above assertion.



Figure 4: The graph G_P.

The second remark shows that when P is a naturally labeled forest with duplications, formula (24) reduces to (5).

Remark 2: Let P be a naturally labeled forest with duplications on $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ as defined by Féray and Reiner [4]. Recall that a poset P is called a forest with duplications if for any connected order ideal J of P, there exists at most one other connected order ideal J' such that J and J' intersect nontrivially. Assume that the graph H_P has h connected components $C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_h$, and for $r \leq d$ the component C_r has more than one vertex, and for $d < r \leq h$ the component C_r has only one vertex. If C_r has more than one vertex, then C_r is an edge connecting two principal order ideals Λ_{i_r} and Λ_{j_r} generated respectively by i_r and j_r. Thus, for $1 \leq r \leq d$,

$$\mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P) = \{\Lambda_{i_r}, \Lambda_{j_r}, \Lambda_{i_r,j_r}\}.$$

Hence there are two possibilities for M_r, namely,

$$M_r = \{\Lambda_{i_r}, \Lambda_{i_r,j_r}\},$$

or

$$M_r = \{\Lambda_{j_r}, \Lambda_{i_r,j_r}\}.$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $i_r < j_r$. On the other hand, for $d < r \leq h$, let Λ_{k_r} be the only vertex in C_r. So we see that for $d < r \leq h$,

$$\mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P) = \{\Lambda_{k_r}\}.$$

By (24), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} F_P(\mathbf{x}) &= \prod_{r\leq d}\left[\frac{1}{(1-\mathbf{x}^{\Lambda_{i_r}})\,(1-\mathbf{x}^{\Lambda_{i_r,j_r}})}+\frac{\mathbf{x}^{\Lambda_{j_r}}}{(1-\mathbf{x}^{\Lambda_r})\,(1-\mathbf{x}^{\Lambda_{i_r,j_r}})}\right] \\ &\quad \times \prod_{d<r\leq h}\frac{1}{(1-\mathbf{x}^{\Lambda_{k_r}})} \\ &= \prod_{r\leq d}\left[\frac{1-\mathbf{x}^{\Lambda_{i_r}}\mathbf{x}^{\Lambda_{j_r}}}{(1-\mathbf{x}^{\Lambda_{i_r}})\,(1-\mathbf{x}^{\Lambda_{j_r}})\,(1-\mathbf{x}^{\Lambda_{i_r,j_r}})}\right]\prod_{d<r\leq h}\frac{1}{(1-\mathbf{x}^{\Lambda_{k_r}})}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{x}^A = \prod_{i\in A} x_i$ for a subset $A \subseteq \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. Clearly, the above expression is the same as (5).

4 Specializations of formula (24)

In this section, we consider some specializations of (24). Letting $x_1 = \cdots = x_n = q$ respectively in Stanley's formula (1) and (24), we are led to the following identity

$$\frac{\sum_{w\in\mathcal{L}(P)} q^{\mathrm{maj}(w)}}{(1-q)\cdots(1-q^n)} = \prod_{r=1}^{h}\sum_{M_r}\frac{q^{\mathrm{maj}(M_r)}}{\prod_{J\in M_r}(1-q^{|J|})},$$

where

$$\mathrm{maj}(w) = \sum_{i\in \mathrm{Des}(w)} i$$

is the major index of w and

$$\mathrm{maj}(M_r) = \sum_{i \in \mathrm{Des}(M_r)} i.$$

Hence, we obtain the following expression for the generating function of the major index of linear extensions of P:

$$\sum_{w \in \mathcal{L}(P)} q^{\mathrm{maj}(w)} = (1-q)\cdots(1-q^n) \prod_{r=1}^{h} \sum_{M_r} \frac{q^{\mathrm{maj}(M_r)}}{\prod_{J \in M_r} (1-q^{|J|})}. \tag{25}$$

Moreover, when q tends to 1 on both sides of (25), we arrive at the following formula for the number of linear extensions of P:

$$|\mathcal{L}(P)| = n! \prod_{r=1}^{h} \sum_{M_r} \frac{1}{\prod_{J \in M_r} |J|}. \tag{26}$$

Note that Brightwell and Winkler [3] showed that computing the number of linear extensions for a general poset is a $\sharp P$-hard problem.

When P is a poset such that each of the sets $\mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P)$ has small size, we shall illustrate that formula (26) provides an efficient way to compute the number of linear extensions of P. Let us consider the poset in Figure 3. For this poset, we have listed $\mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P)$ $(1 \le r \le 9)$ before Lemma 3.2, from which it is easy to check that

1. For $\mathcal{J}^1_{conn}(P)$, there are 6 choices for M_1:

$$\{\Lambda_4, \Lambda_{4,5}, \Lambda_{4,5,6}\}, \{\Lambda_4, \Lambda_{4,6}, \Lambda_{4,5,6}\}, \{\Lambda_5, \Lambda_{4,5}, \Lambda_{4,5,6}\},$$

$$\{\Lambda_5, \Lambda_{5,6}, \Lambda_{4,5,6}\}, \{\Lambda_6, \Lambda_{4,6}, \Lambda_{4,5,6}\}, \{\Lambda_6, \Lambda_{5,6}, \Lambda_{4,5,6}\};$$

2. For $\mathcal{J}^2_{conn}(P)$, there are 5 choices for M_2:

$$\{\Lambda_{10}, \Lambda_{15}, \Lambda_{13,15}, \Lambda_{14,15}\}, \{\Lambda_{10}, \Lambda_{10,13}, \Lambda_{14}, \Lambda_{14,15}\},$$

$$\{\Lambda_{10}, \Lambda_{10,13}, \Lambda_{13,15}, \Lambda_{14,15}\}, \{\Lambda_{13}, \Lambda_{10,13}, \Lambda_{14}, \Lambda_{14,15}\},$$
$$\{\Lambda_{13}, \Lambda_{10,13}, \Lambda_{13,15}, \Lambda_{14,15}\};$$

3. For $\mathcal{J}^3_{conn}(P)$, there are 3 choices for M_3:

$$\{\Lambda_{11}, \Lambda_{11,9}, \Lambda_{11,12}\}, \{\Lambda_9, \Lambda_{11,9}, \Lambda_{11,12}\}, \{\Lambda_9, \Lambda_{12}, \Lambda_{11,12}\}.$$

4. For $\mathcal{J}^4_{conn}(P)$, there are 2 choices for M_4:

$$\{\Lambda_{16}, \Lambda_{16,17}\}, \{\Lambda_{17}, \Lambda_{16,17}\};$$

5. For $r = 5, 6, 7, 8, 9$, since the set $\mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P)$ has only one element, there is only one choice for each M_r, that is, $M_r = \mathcal{J}^r_{conn}(P)$.

Therefore, invoking Theorem 3.7, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{w\in\mathcal{L}(P)} q^{\mathrm{maj}(w)} &= [17]!_q \frac{(1+2q^3+2q^5+q^8)}{[3]_q[5]_q[6]_q}\left[\frac{1}{[15]_q}\left(\frac{q^{13}+1+q^{14}}{[7]_q[13]_q[14]_q}+\frac{q^{12}+q^{26}}{[12]_q[13]_q[14]_q}\right)\right] \\ &\quad\times\left[\frac{1}{[5]_q}\left(\frac{q^3}{[3]_q[4]_q}+\frac{1}{[2]_q[4]_q}+\frac{q^3}{[2]_q[3]_q}\right)\right]\frac{(1+q^{16})}{[16]_q[17]_q},\end{aligned}$$

where we use the notation $[m]_q = 1-q^m$ for any positive integer m. Notice that we use Sage [9] to compute that $|\mathcal{L}(P)| = 2851200$. On the other hand, letting $q \to 1$ in the above formula, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathcal{L}(P)| &= 17!\times\left(\frac{1}{6}\times\frac{6}{3\times 5}\right)\times\left[\frac{1}{15}\times\left(\frac{3}{7\times 13\times 14}+\frac{2}{13\times 12\times 14}\right)\right] \\ &\quad\times\left[\frac{1}{5}\times\left(\frac{1}{3\times 4}+\frac{1}{3\times 2}+\frac{1}{4\times 2}\right)\right]\times\left(\frac{1}{17}\times\frac{2}{16}\right) \\ &= 2851200.\end{aligned}$$

Acknowledgments. This work was supported by the 973 Project, the PCSIRT Project of the Ministry of Education, the National Science Foundation of China.

References

[1] A. Björner and M.L. Wachs, q-Hook length formulas for forests, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A 52 (1989), 165–187.

[2] A. Boussicault, V. Féray, A. Lascoux and V. Reiner, Linear extension sums as valuations on cones, J. Algebraic Combin. 35 (2012), 573–610.

[3] G. Brightwell and P. Winkler, Counting linear extensions, Order 8 (1991), 225–242.

[4] V. Féray and V. Reiner, P-partitions revisited, J. Commut. Algebra 4 (2012), 101–152.

[5] I.M. Gessel, A historical survey of P-partitions, arXiv:1506.03508.

[6] A. Postnikov, Permutahedra, associahedra, and beyond, Int. Math. Res. Not. (2009), 1026–1106.

[7] A. Postnikov, V. Reiner and L. Williams, Faces of generalized permutohedra, Doc. Math. 13 (2008), 207–273.

[8] R. Stanley, Enumerative Combinatorics, Vol. 1, 2nd edition, Cambridge University Press, 2012.

[9] W.A. Stein et al. Sage Mathematics Software (Version 5.12), The Sage Development Team, 2009, http://www.sagemath.org.